ADE & COMPANY PATENT AND TRADEMARK AGENTS

ADRIAN D. BATTISON, B.Sc., F.P.T.I.C Michael R. Williams, B.Sc., Ph.D., A.P.T.I.C. RYAN W. DUPUIS, B. Sc.,. A.P.T.I.C.

RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER NOV 2 5 2004

> 1700-360 Main Street Winnipeg, Manitoba Canada R3C 3Z3

Telephone (204)947- 1429 Facsimile (204) 942-5723 E-Mail: info@adeco.com

Our File: 85279-102/RWD

FACSIMILE COVER LETTER

PLEASE DELIVER THE FOLLOWING PAGE	GES TO:
NAME:	Commissioner of Patents – KIRAN B. PATEI
FACSIMILE NUMBER:	1-703-872-9306
FROM:	Ryan W. Dupuis
TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES INCLUDING	THIS COVER LETTER:
DATE:	November 25, 2004
TELEPHONE:(204) 947-1429	FACSIMILE: (204) 942-5723
	HEATHER KIRKPATRICK
CONFIDENTIAL USE OF THE DESIGNATED RECIPIENTS N. THE INTENDED RECIPIENT OR AN AGENT RESPONSIBLE F HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS DOCU- DISTRIBUTION. OR COPYING OF THIS MESSAGE IS:	ESSAGE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE PERSONAL AND AMED ABOVE. IF THE READER OF THIS MESSAGE IS NOT FOR DELIVERING IT YO THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE JIMENT IN ERROR, AND THAT ANY REVIEW, DISSEMINATION, STRICTLY PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS EDIATELY BY TELEPHONE AND RETURN THE ORIGINAL

United States Patent Application no: 10/724,699 RE:

Filed December 2, 2003

Kit and Method for Truck Cab Conversion EXAMINER -Kiran B. Patel GROUP 3612

Response/amendment to Notice of Action dated and a request for a 1 MONTH extension of time in duplicate.

IF ALL PAGES ARE NOT RECEIVED OR ANY ARE NOT LEGIBLE. PLEASE CALL AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.

RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER NUV 2 5 2004

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO: 85279-102/RWD

EXAMINER

Kiran B. Patel

GROUP

3612

APPLICANT

Darryl Budge

SERIAL NO:

10/724,699

FILED

December 2, 2003

FOR

Kit and Method for Truck Cab Conversion

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office 2011 South Clark Place Customer Window, Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment Crystal Plaza Two, Lobby, Room 1B03 Arlington, Virginia 22202 U.S.A.

Dear Sir:

Responsive to the Notice of Action dated October 26, 2004

REMARKS:

In response to the requirement for restriction, the applicant provisionally elects the Examiner's Group II, Claims 15 through 20 drawn to a kit. Reconsideration of the requirement for restriction however is respectfully requested. The restriction between Groups I and II is therefore traversed.

Having considered the Examiner's arguments, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's Groups I and II are not distinct in the manner suggested. First the Examiner states that the invention relates to a process of making and a product made in accordance with section 806.05(f) of MPEP. This however is incorrect as the process according to claim 1 does not result in